

**GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY CHARTING FORUM**  
**Instrument Procedures Subgroup**  
**November 28-29, 2000**  
**HISTORY RECORD**

**FAA Control # 00-02-232**

**SUBJECT:** Confusing Graphical or Textual Feeder Routes.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:** Attached are eight approach charts (four Jeppesen and four NOS), two of each type for KPQI and two of each type for KAVP. These procedures share a similar human-factors problem in that they have lengthy feeder routes that extend well beyond the plan view of the chart. In the case of the KPQI ILS chart, Jeppesen elected to use a graphical inset box, plus one textual feeder route. Because AVN-100 saw a need to serve both DME and non-DME equipped aircraft on one chart, the nuisances of the terminal routing are just about impossible to figure out on this chart, especially in-flight. Note that the KPQI VOR chart is far less confusing, partially because DME is mandatory.

In the case of the KAVP ILS Runway 4 approach, the feeder route is textual, which is contrary to the purpose of charts in the place. The KAVP NDB-A approach is worse with three textual feeder routes.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Feeder routes that exceed the scale used by Jeppesen for its plan view should be limited to a single feeder route from any arrival quadrant, so that an comprehensible graphical inset can be employed by Jeppesen, and that textual feeder routes can be avoided all together. In some cases, Victor airway extensions into such a location could be appropriate, so that the terminal routing is available on the en route chart. Although Jeppesen charts are not the "official government" charts they are, in fact, used by virtually all airline pilots. ALPA finds the Jeppesen format to be well accepted by our membership and air carrier flight operations management in general. This recommendation is to assist both Jeppesen and our pilots to resolve these examples of terminal routing construction that are incompatible with the charting format of preference for our members.

**COMMENTS:** This affects FAA Handbook 8260.19, "Flight Procedures and Airspace," and related AFS-420/AVN-100 internal directives.

Submitted by Captain Simon Lawrence, Chairman  
Charting and Instrument Procedures Program

**AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION**

PH: (703) 689-4176

FAX: (703) 689-4370

October 12, 2000

---

**INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 00-02):** ALPA presented this issue the ACF, Charting Portion; however, it was transferred to the Instrument Procedures Subgroup for tracking and action. ALPA is concerned that some feeder routes developed for SIAP's are unable to be charted by Jeppesen, whose charts are used by their membership and air carriers in general. They recommend that feeder routes be limited to a single route from each quadrant so that Jeppesen may create a comprehensible chart inset and avoid textual routes. They provided several Jeppesen and government charts for comparison (Presque Isle, ME and Wilkes-Barre/Scranton, PA). Dave Eckles, AFS-420, noted that the examples did have excessive feeder routes and that he would take an IOU to review the policy. It should be noted that the procedure development policy is not written solely to support Jeppesen charting specifications. **Action AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 01-01:** Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper on the issue. Review of the examples presented by ALPA at the last meeting reveals that there are several feeder routes published on each procedure. Current policy requires the establishment of at least one non-radar route to ensure transition from the en route structure in the event of radar/communication failure. Where more than one such route is established, the circumstances of their establishment (ATC request, normal traffic flow, etc.) must be considered before "excessiveness" can be determined. These type issues are what the proposed RAPT concept under Order 8260.43A is intended to handle. Pending implementation of the order, recommend ALPA identify suspect procedures to AVN-100 for review and determination of need for amendment to comply with existing policy. Dave added that procedure development policy is not written solely to support Jeppesen charting specifications and recommended that ALPA approach Jeppesen with recommendations for a better method of depicting multiple feeder routes. He recommended the issue be closed. The group concurred **ACTION: Closed.**

---